

REMARKS

The Official Action of June 11, 2004, and the prior art cited and relied upon therein have been carefully studied. The claims in the application are now claims 1-6 and 8-17, and these claims define patentable subject matter warranting their allowance. Favorable reconsideration and such allowance are respectfully urged.

Claim 7 has been canceled and new claims 9-17 added. Claims 1-6 and 8-17 remain in the application for consideration.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for his indication that claims 2 and 3 would be allowable subject to being rewritten in independent form. In response, Applicant has combined the features of original claim 1 and allowable claim 2 in new independent claim 9 and the features of original claim 1 and allowable claim 3 in new independent claim 13. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 9 and 12 are now allowable, along with claims 10, 12, 14, 15 and 16 which are dependent therefrom.

The Examiner has further rejected claims 1, 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kitajima '325,

claims 1, 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Sugawara '776, and claims 6-8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitajima. Applicant respectfully traverses all of these rejections especially as applied to the claims as amended, and new claim 17.

Applicant does not agree that either Kitajima '325 or Sugawara '776 teaches "a cover having two arms each of which have a distal end fixed to the engagement portion under the rotor" as now claimed by Applicant.

Kitajima provides only a cover 35 mounted on the reel body 2 by an unnumbered bolt shown in Fig. 2, wherein the bolt is not located on the engagement portion 27 and under the rotor 3 (see Fig. 2 wherein the unnumbered bolt fixes cover 38 to leg portion 36 and not engagement portion 27 as indicated by the Examiner).

Sugawara also provides only a cover 13 mounted on reel body 2 by an unnumbered bolt shown in Fig. 3, wherein the bolt is not located on the engagement portion 2e,2g of reel body 2 and under the rotor 3 as claimed by Applicant.

Applicant respectfully submits that neither Kitajima or Sugawara teach the unique engagement of the claimed cover

to the engagement portion under the rotor as claimed, and that claims 1, 4, 5 and 17 are clearly patentable over the cited prior art.

With regard to claims 6 and 8, Kitajima does teach the claimed hook portion which facilitates arranging the surface of the cover to be flush with that of the reel body as claimed. This combination of features is clearly not shown or taught by Kitajima.

The prior art documents made of record and not relied upon have been noted along with the implication that such documents are deemed by the PTO to be insufficiently pertinent to warrant their applications against any of applicant's claims.

Favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By 
Norman J. Latker
Registration No. 19,963

NJL:ma
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\bn\d\dire\chang187\pto\Amendment-A.doc